

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This amendment is a resubmittal of the Amendment filed August 6, 2008, but the claims now conform with the corrections required in the Non-Compliant Amendment Notification dated September 2, 2008.

The Office Action dated May 6, 2008 has been received and duly noted. Applicant has elected species A, Claims 1-9 and 11-24. As noted by the Examiner, certain of the claims are generic. Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to overcome the objection noted by the Examiner.

A majority of the claims were rejected as being anticipated by Andrews, U.S. Patent 2,702,715, or were rejected as being unpatentable over Andrews. A significant distinction between the present invention and the disclosure of Andrews is that, if the elongate connection structure 3 of the first body 1 of Andrews reads on the first step of Claim 1, then Andrews does not satisfy step 2 by selectively cutting the first body to reduce the axial length of the connection structure on the first body. The disclosure of Andrews suggests that pipe 1 could be cut off at its extreme end and then threaded so as to mate with collar 7. Rather than cut off the length of the first body then thread the cut-off first body, as suggested by Andrews, Applicant teaches providing an elongate connection structure on the first body, then cutting the first body to reduce the axial length of the connection structure. Nowhere does Andrews disclose or suggest reducing the axial length of the threads 3 so that the connection structure would terminate a desired axial connection location. To the contrary, threads 3 are disclosed as tapered threads, so that the final makeup position of pipe 1 relative to collar 7 is

fixed, and shortening the axial length of tapered threads 3 would not affect the axial position of collar 7.

As noted in the background of the present invention, Applicant is concerned with a low cost technique for positioning the top of the first body at a desired elevation, so that another body, such as a flange, can be positioned on that first body with the top of the first body then at a desired axial location. This is why the first body is threaded, then cut. This is not the purpose of Andrews '715, and Andrews cannot accomplish this function. First, Andrews discloses a pipe coupling which allows pipe 1 to be joined with pipe 2, with the pipe ends positioned at a variable distance as a function of the threaded position of collar 7 relative to collar 8. Nowhere does Andrews disclose reducing the axial length of a connection structure on a first body so that the connection structure terminates at a desired axial location. Andrews may reduce the axial length of the first body, but that operation does not shorten the connection structure. The axial length of each of the threaded components in Andrews have a fixed length, and only the relative position of the collars 7 and 8 is changed to achieve the makeup. To the extent that the body 1 of Andrews is the first body and the second body is element 6, as suggested by the Examiner, threads on the second body do not engage threads of the first body, as recited in Claim 4.

With respect to dependent Claims 6-8, there are various techniques to insulate one member from another. The specific technique used by Applicant to provide on electrical insulation between specific bodies is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

Appl. No.: 10/527,419  
Amendment Dated: September 19, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of May 6, 2008


With respect to dependent Claim 12, the Examiner incorrectly assumes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that reducing the axial length of the connection structure following connecting the second body with the first body. This is simply not true. One skilled in the art logically would assume that the connection structure on the first body should be cut before connecting that structure to a second body.

With respect to independent Claim 13, Applicant's comments as set forth above with respect to Claim 1 apply to Claim 13 also.

Independent Claim 14 is considered patentably distinct from the cited references, since the cited references do not disclose selectively cutting the first body to reduce an axial length of the connection structure on the first body, as set forth above. The features of dependent Claims 17-19 and 21, 22, and 24 were also discussed above.

In view of the above, early allowance of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Loren G. Helmreich  
Reg. No. 29,389

Date: September 19, 2008

BROWNING BUSHMAN P.C.  
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1800  
Houston, Texas 77057-5771  
Tel.: (713) 266-5593  
Fax: (713) 266-5169